

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/673,569	09/30/2003	Daniel R. Neal	WFS.004C	. 1614	
7590 07/27/2004		EXAMINER			
VOLENTINE FRANCOS, PLLC SUITE 150			DUDA, KATHLEEN		
12200 SUNRISE VALLEY DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
RESTON, VA	20191		1756		
			DATE MAILED: 07/27/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				A.				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	0				
Office Action Summary		10/673,569	NEAL ET AL.	•				
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Kathleen Duda	1756					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the provision of the pro	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered time the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
	☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
Dispositi	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-8,11-18 and 26-45 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-8,11-18 and 26-45 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>							
Applicati	ion Papers							
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C	• •				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>								
Attachmen	t(s)							
2) Notic 3) Inforr Pape	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate	O-152)				

Art Unit: 1756

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Information Disclosure Statement

1. The Information Disclosure Statement filed September 30, 2003 has been considered. The application number has not been listed on a PTO-892 to avoid disclosure. The Canadian patent and other document have been crossed off because they were not received by the examiner.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

  The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 is indefinite in reciting "the substrate" since both claims 1 and 2 refer to two different substrates.

Claim 4 is indefinite in reciting "the deposited coating" since both claims 1 and 2 recite different coatings.

Art Unit: 1756

## **Double Patenting**

Page 3

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 5. Claims 1, 11-18 and 26-45 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,656,373. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both the patent and application recite a method of forming optical density profiles in the same manner.
- 6. Claims 2-8 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,656,373 in view of Balz (US Patent 5,509,556). Claims

Art Unit: 1756

2-8 of the application recite the process of forming the mask which is not taught in the claims of the patent. Balz teaches the method of making a mask. Balz teaches a method of making apertures in a metal sheet which can then be used as a mask (column 1, lines 6-16). Column 1, line 51 to column 2, line 2, teach the conventionality of using photolithography to form metal masks. Column 2, lines 40-57, teach using a laser to form the holes in a metal layer which is then used as a mask. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form a metal mask with holes by photolithography or laser ablation because Balz teaches that such methods are conventionally known in the art.

Page 4

### Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner K. Duda at (571) 272-1383. Official FAX communications should be sent to (703) 872-9306.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Huff, can be reached at 571-272-1385.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Art Unit: 1756

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kathleen Duda Primary Examiner Art Unit 1756

Page 5